

CARLTON B PARKS,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	Case No. 1:19-cv-00349
v.)	
)	Judge Matthew F. Leitman
JEFFREY J LYASH, <i>et al.</i> ,)	Magistrate Judge Steger
)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	
)	
_____)	

In this action, Plaintiff Carlton Parks alleges, among other things, that the Defendants subjected him to race and age discrimination in violation of federal and state laws. (*See* First Am. Compl., ECF No. 17.) On March 1, 2021, Parks filed a motion for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 31.) In the Second Amended Complaint, Parks seeks to bring additional claims against the Defendants. (*See* Proposed Sec. Am. Compl., ECF No. 32.)

1

his new claims were barred by the applicable statute of limitations (*Id.*, PageID.381-382.) At the conclusion of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge informed the parties that if they wanted to seek review of the recommendation, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.* n.4, PageID.382.)

Parks has not filed any objections to the R&R. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Likewise, the failure to file objections to an R&R waives any further right to appeal. *See Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, because Parks has failed to file any objections to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of his motion for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Parks' motion for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 31) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SITTING BY SPECIAL DESIGNATION

Dated: October 18, 2021